

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT CHATTANOOGA

ROBERT P. JOHNSON,)
v. Plaintiff,) No. 1:15-cv-59-HSM-SKL-1
CASEY STOKES, Judge Meigs County,)
Defendant.)

ORDER

Before the Court is an Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (“Application”) [Doc. 2] filed by Robert P. Johnson. Mr. Johnson’s Complaint appears to attempt to allege a claim based on the actions of a General Sessions Court Judge in Meigs County, Tennessee and he requests \$25,000 in damages “for lost wages” and \$100,000 for pain and suffering [Doc. 1].

Because the Application did not contain sufficient information to allow the Court to determine if Mr. Johnson was indigent for purposes of waiving the filing fee, the Court ordered Mr. Johnson to submit a proper and complete Application within 30 days of the filing of the Order [Doc. 3]. The time to submit a proper and complete Application has now passed, and Mr. Johnson has not submitted any further information in support of his Application. Accordingly, I

RECOMMEND that Mr. Johnson's Application [Doc. 2] be **DENIED** and the case be **CLOSED.**¹

SO ORDERED.

ENTER:

s/ Susan K. Lee

SUSAN K. LEE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ Any objections to this report and recommendation must be served and filed within fourteen (14) days after service of a copy of this recommended disposition on the objecting party. Such objections must conform to the requirements of Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Failure to file objections within the time specified waives the right to appeal the district court's order. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 & n.7 (1985). The district court need not provide *de novo* review where objections to this report and recommendation are frivolous, conclusive and general. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986). Only specific objections are reserved for appellate review. *Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).